

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O. I	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/656,063	10/656,063 09/05/2003		Hassan Mostafavi	8329		
23639	7590	06/15/2006		EXAMINER		
	•	JTCHEN LLP	SONG, HOON K			
THREE E		DERO CENTER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4067				2882		
				DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/656,063	MOSTAFAVI, HASSAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Hoon Song	2882	

Poforo the Eiling of an Anneal Brief								
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Hoon Song	2882						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 May 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection.						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or								
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ejected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		•	,					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 		, timely filed amendn	nent canceling					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-34,48-50 and 54-65</u> . Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>35-47 and 51-53</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a f nd sufficient reasons why the affida	Notice of Appeal will just or other evidence	<u>not</u> be entered is necessary					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fo	ails to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or atta	ched.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allow	ance because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)						
and the second								
		EDWARD J. GLICK ISORY PATENT EX						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 5/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Eck (US 7003146B2) fails to teach at least portion of the first and at least portion of the second image comprises images of a same portion of an object. The examiner disagrees.

Eck teaches the attenuation of the measured signals changes for successive x-ray images while the patient is in the x-ray beam path (column 3 line 37-42) and the image data is smoothed and averaged (column 3 line 40-42) for correcting off-set error. Accordingly, Eck's plurality of images are considered to contain same portion of the patient and the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Maschke (US 6940945B2) fails to teach the first and second images are generated in a sequence. The examiner disagrees.

Maschke teaches the second x-ray image was acquired at a later examination data, such as during the current examination of the patient (column 2 line 57-59). Accordingly, Maschke clearly teaches that the first and second images are generated in a sequence and the applicant's argument is not persuasive.